## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION

	STATES DISTRICT COURT
	N DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION
United States of America,	STATES DISTRICT COURT N DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION  Case No. CR 17-0134 HSG
Plaintiff, )	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
v. BENFORD CHAVIS	THIRD ONDER THE OFELDS I TRUME ACT
Defendant.	
For the reason stated by the parties on the record on $\frac{4-14}{}$ , 2017, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from $\frac{4-14}{}$ , 2017, to $\frac{5-10}{}$ , 2017 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factors:	
Failure to grant a continuance See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)	would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. (I).
The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [circle applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).	
Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
	cord, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § nsent of the defendant under Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure
	cord, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § ting from removal/transport of the defendant to another district.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED:	
	DONNA M. RYU United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	May Glimber Assistant United States Attorney

Attorney for Defendant